

PATENT  
B588-010

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Masahiko Sakayori et al.  
Serial No. : 09/156,311  
For : PARTS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM AND PARTS  
MANAGEMENT METHOD, AND STORAGE MEDIUM  
Filed : September 17, 1998  
Examiner : F. Backer  
Art Unit : 3621

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

This Response is submitted as being responsive to the Office Action mailed November 6, 2002 for the above application. No extension of time is believed to be required based upon the filing of this Response on the deadline of the three-month statutory period (February 6, 2003). However, authorization is granted to charge our deposit account no. 18-1644, if necessary, for any fees needed for entry of this response.

A review of the file for this application shows that there are several issues that require correction and entry by the Examiner. First, with respect to filing of certified copies of the priority documents for this application with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO"), it is noted that such certified copies were filed with the "Amendment in Response to Office Action" filed May 8, 2001 with mail certification with the PTO. A recent printout from the PAIR system, a copy of which is attached, appears to confirm that such certified copies were

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to facsimile number (703) 872-9326 on the date shown below:

February 6, 2003

February 6, 2003

Date of Signature

MARV L. JENNINGS

Signature

filed with the PTO on May 11, 2001 (see entries numbered 14-16). However, in the Office Action mailed July 30, 2001, the Examiner indicates on the "Office Action Summary" page that "none" of the certified copies of the priority documents were received. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify this inconsistency and notify the undersigned counsel by telephone (212-682-9640) on the status of these documents and confirm the entry thereof.

Second, it is noted that in the same Amendment filed May 8, 2001, the undersigned counsel submitted a "Request for Approval of Drawing Changes" to correct Figures 4 and 25B. (copies of filed papers attached) The enclosed printout from the PAIR system for this application appears to confirm that this Request was also filed with the PTO on May 11, 2001 (see entry numbered 19). However, it does not appear in the Office Actions filed in this application since the Request was filed that these drawing corrections have been approved. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of this Request and indicate whether or not such corrections are approved of by the Examiner.

Third, it is noted that in the Supplemental Office Action mailed June 19, 2002 the reference designated "AX" (Hitachi Groupmax Integrated Desktop Version 2.0) was not initialed by the Examiner as having been reviewed. Accordingly, I have enclosed a copy of the PTO-1449 form that we received from the PTO and would appreciate the Examiner initialing next to this reference and returning the completed form to undersigned counsel as soon as possible.

Please note that your attention and clarification of the above issues are greatly appreciated. The undersigned counsel will be telephoning the Examiner next week to see if the Examiner has any questions or requires further clarification concerning these issues.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "claims 60-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. 6,324,522) in view of Wiecha (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,717)." However, on the Office Action Summary page and as mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 5-19 of the Office Action, it is believed that the Examiner intended to state that claims 60-96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Peterson et al. reference in view of the Wiecha reference. Accordingly, based upon this assumption, the rejections of claims 60-96 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present claimed invention is directed to a parts management system, method and storage medium, which enables management of the form by which a processing status of orders received and/or orders placed is easily and immediately understood as visual information by displaying a management item by a combination of an icon and data. Particularly, contents of the parts management are determined as to whether: (a) orders are received and placed or; (b) orders are received; or (c) orders are placed. Management information corresponding to these modes or conditions is then enabled to be indicated by selectively displaying the result. Display controlling for the combination of the icon and data in the form of a graph and/or table is performed. With respect to the independent claims, an icon corresponds to the management item and data indicating a status of the management item (e.g., claims 60-69) and a plurality of management items are displayed for parts management and detailed information on selected management items can be displayed in the form of a graph (e.g., claims 70-82) and/or table (e.g., claims 82-96). It is accordingly submitted that neither reference, either alone or in alleged combination, discloses or suggests the claimed systems, methods or storage mediums of the independent claims.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, the Peterson et al. reference does not disclose "display

control means for controlling display on display means, which determining the status of the order of a combination of an icon corresponding to a management item and data indicating a status of the management item represented by the icon.”

Rather the Peterson et al. reference discloses an industrial maintenance repair and operating (MRO) system for parts and supplies where orders for which a user has already placed to vendors can be displayed and checked by an Order Status Function. The contents of such processing shown by Figs. 14, 15 and 18 are therefore limited only to the processing for a user placing orders to vendors. Particularly, as shown in the flowchart of Fig. 14 of Peterson et al., the user selects a vendor's name in step 306. The vendor's main page 308 is then shown and is divided into three sections: a Banner, A Menu Options area and a Quick Search area 310 (see col. 21, ls. 55-64). The user then selects content which should be displayed from the Menu Options area. The information display by this system is thus passive - the user does not receive new orders (orders received) by an information network - rather the user only places new orders to vendors.

The system of Peterson et al., also discloses displaying the operation of an order status page with the user reviewing “orders that the user has previously placed with the user's vendor, selected in step 308, by clicking on the ‘Get Order Status’ button 600 (Fig. 14).” When button 600 is clicked, a getting order status processing will be started (Fig. 18) with “New Orders”, “Orders in Process” and “Processed Orders” being displayed on the vendor's Order Status page 602 (col. 35, ls. 1-4). However, even when the user places a new order (see Fig. 14) and a new order starts (Fig. 15), the “new order” of Figs. 14, 15 and 18 in Peterson et al., is not a “received order” but rather a newly placed order to vendors by the user. Again, this display of

the order status page is passive being based on the requirement of the user and does not disclose or suggest a user receiving new orders (orders received) by an information network.

Nor does the Peterson et al. reference disclose or suggest a change of display that determines three conditions ((a) orders received and placed; or (b) orders received; or (c) orders placed) and the contents performing the display control of the system actively according to the determination result as in the present invention. Nor does Peterson et al. disclose or suggest control for displaying a combination of an icon and data in accordance with the determination result or the processing of graph display and/or table form display related to the inputted data. Accordingly, display control means of the systems, methods and storage mediums, as claimed in the independent claims of the present invention, is not disclosed or suggested by this reference.

With respect to the secondary reference, Wiecha, it discloses a system for purchasing goods using an electronic catalog on a computer network. The electronic catalog displays various goods as well as usual catalog informational magazines on the computer screen. A buyer can select some goods which can be ordered from the display of the electronic catalog. Vendors will then send acknowledgments and status messages with respect to the purchase order of the buyer (col. 10, ls. 39-44). A processing status based on the purchase order is then updated and checked subsequently. The system also performs a previously defined action according to the purchase order being approved or rejected.

Although the contents of Wiecha are related to the updating of electronic catalog data and processing of the purchase order, the data processing of Wiecha is limited to the "orders placed" side. "Orders received and placed" and "Orders received" are not taken into account in the system

of Wiecha. More particularly, this system does not disclose or suggest determining three conditions or modes as in the present claimed invention, e.g., whether orders have been received and placed; or orders have been received; or orders have been placed.

Further, the action which is performed by the system of Wiecha is previously defined according to the case by which the purchase order is approved or rejected (col. 12, ls. 38-49). Thus, this system does not disclose or suggest determining the action actively based on whether or not data inputted is of orders received and placed, or orders received or orders placed and does not update the data according to the determination result. Rather the action of Wiecha is of predefined contents without active determination.

Additionally, the contents displayed on the electronic catalog of Wiecha are individual goods data and are the only data for calculating the order sum total of the designated goods. Such are not a management item classified according to the determination of the result (e.g., orders received and placed; or orders received; or orders placed). Nor does the display of the electronic catalog disclose the combination of an icon corresponding to a management item and data indicating a status of the management item represented by the icon as in the present invention. Accordingly, this reference fails to disclose or suggest display control means, as claimed in the independent claims.

Nor does the suggested alleged combination of the references disclose or suggest active display control for determining display modes or conditions and does not determine actively whether or not inputted data corresponds to which of three modes or conditions (e.g., orders received and placed; or orders received; or orders placed). Further, neither reference nor the alleged combination thereof discloses controlling for display a combination of an icon and data in

accordance with the determination result and processing for graph display and/or table form display related to inputted data. Rather these references disclose technology which only displays a received user's selection without "display control" and "determination of display mode", as claimed in the present invention. It is therefore submitted that neither reference, either alone or in alleged combination, discloses or suggests the systems, methods and storage mediums, as claimed in the independent claims. The independent claims are therefore submitted as being patentable.

Based upon the patentability of the independent claims, the dependent claims are also submitted as being patentable since they differ in scope from the parent independent claims.

If the Examiner believes that an interview would expedite consideration of this Response or of the application, a request is made that the Examiner telephone applicants' undersigned counsel at (212) 682-9640.

Dated: February 6, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

ROBIN BLECKER & DALEY  
330 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
T (212) 682-9640



Marylee Jenkins  
Reg. No. 37,645  
Attorney of Record